SIXTH LECTURE,

BEFORE THE

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

OF NOVA SCOTIA.

BY REV. JOHN HUNTER.

PRICE FOUR-PENCE.

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE LECTURES.

REVIEW

OF

E. MATURIN'S LETTER.

SIXTH LECTURE,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

OF NOVA SCOTIA.

AT TEMPERANCE HALL, HALIFAX, ON FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 11th, 1859.

BY REV. JOHN HUNTER.

HALIFAX, N. S.:
PRINTED AT THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE STEAM PRESS.
1859.

ERRATA.

Page 15. For "Anucletus" read "Anacletus."
" 16. For "deposed all these," read "deposed all three."
" 16. For "Balthusa," read "Balthasar."
" 18. For "they are at once," read "they are at one."
" 18. In the last line omit "made."
" 19. For "they are not as one," read "they are not at one."
" 19. For "Losinius," read "Zosimus." Also on pp. 20,24,25.
" 20 For "communions," read "communities."
" 20. For "Jansarius," read "Jansenius."
" 20. For "manifested views," read "maintained views."
" 24. For "pictures," read "pretences."
" 32. For "Are we to believe these," read "Are we to believe then."
" 32. For "knowledge of God," read "knowledge of Christ."
" 34. For "teaching the Divine," read "testing the Divine."
" 37. Omit "unanimous" before Catholic.
" 37. For "Churches were not nations," read "Churches were not national."

REVIEW, &c.

BY REV. JOHN HUNTER.

A FEW months ago the citizens of Halifax were startled by the information that the REV. E. MATURIN, Curate of St. Paul's, had become a pervert to Popery. This change on his part excited the more attention that Mr. Maturin had always been supposed to hold very Evangelical views. I know not what were the explanations he offered in private. But about five weeks since a pamphlet was placed in my hands entitled "The Claims of the Catholic Church, by E. Maturin, M. A." On perusal of it, its contents seemed at once naturally to fall under three heads: An explanation of Mr. Maturin's own feelings and conduct; an insidious attack upon the Church of England, but more especially on the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation; and lastly, a plausible defence of some of the leading tenets of Popery. At the time when Mr. Maturin's pamphlet was published I was engaged, at such intervals as my pastoral duties would permit, in throwing together materials for a lecture before this Alliance, on a different subject. This night was fixed beforehand for the delivery of it, and it occurred to me that it might be of some use if an answer came from this platform to attacks on our common Protestantism. I do not appear here to-night as the apologist or the defender of the Church of England. She needs no extraneous aid. There are distinct reasons why I as a

Presbyterian minister cannot maintain all the positions taken up by the Church of England. Even if I could agree with her in non-essentials, it would be unsuitable for the minister of another Church to constitute himself champion of that denomination whose Divines, in this very controversy with Rome, have been among the mightiest defenders of Christianity. I shall therefore leave untouched those parts of the pamphlet which peculiarly concern the Church of England. These portions are few, and, in reference to the main subject, unimportant.

It is pleasant, in a controversy such as this, to observe how substantial is the unity of true Protestants. And for myself I feel it a gratification to express my sympathy with honest hearted men in their struggle against traitors within their Church, as well as against bitter foes without. One important practical result of the dispute with Rome should be to bring Protestants closer together in the bonds of unity and love. It is not only wicked, it is simply absurd, for any Protestant to unchurch other Protestants. The moment they do so they practically unchurch themselves—they leave the only true foundation, the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to build upon that pretended rock "the Church,"—they shake hands with Rome, and speak with her false and unholy voice. The true unity consists in love to God, and in faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ—the false unity consists in a similarity of outward forms and ceremonies. The former is that of Protestantism, whose centre and head are in Heaven—the latter is that of Popery, whose centre and head are at Rome.

It may be expected that I should say something regarding the author of the Pamplet. I shall not dwell long on so trivial a subject. Mr. Maturin has not left much for me to do,—he has exposed and pilloried himself. The account he has given of his conduct towards the Church of which he was lately a minister, is one that must fill every honest man with

a feeling of loathing. For eighteen years the sworn minister of the Church of England, yet all the while thinking the Reformation a schism—admiring Popish tenets, believing Popish creeds, corresponding with a Popish Priest—known to a Popish Bishop as Catholic in heart—what is all this but the thin veil which shrouds the fact that he was all along an emissary of Rome in the midst of us? I may be wrong, but this is the impression forced home on my mind by the reading of the Pamphlet—taking it for granted that it is his own production. And this I will add regarding that document, that it is in every way suitable to such an authorship, and to the history of the Church whose claims it advocates. It is written with great craft, containing not only perversions of Scripture, but a skilful use of sophistical reasoning which could only have been employed by one who was aware that he was constructing arguments that were false, and fitted to mislead. Its references to history are in many cases utterly untrue—its quotations from the Fathers, I shall prove to you to-night are garbled and perverted; and the author has left himself without excuse, for he boasts of his learning in Ecclesiastical history—of his careful verification of his authorities from original sources.

Mr. Maturin charges Protestantism with being an aggression on the Church of Rome; and in another place he congratulates himself that when he returned to the bosom of that Church he was received in the use of a creed employed long before the days of Pope Pius IV,—by Pope Gregory the Great. Now does Mr. Maturin profess to be a scholar versed in Ecclesiastical History, and yet remain ignorant that it was this very Pope Gregory the Great who first brought England into connection with the See of Rome—that the mission he sent landed in the Isle of Thanet, A. D. 596, and that on its arrival the emissaries of Rome found in full existence a British Christian Church, which had been there for centuries

before, perfectly independent of the Pope, denying and resisting his supremacy, joining with the Eastern Church on those points in which she differed form the Romish communion? Further, let me tell you, and I do so on the authority of a Romish historian, that so far from Protestantism being an aggression on the Church of Rome, the Christianity of England, Ireland, and Scotland dates back for centuries before their intercourse with Popery. And the history of Rome's first intercourse with these early Christian Churches is that of a foul and bloody aggression on the rights of conscience, and the liberties of freemen. It was by fraud and force that she paved the way for the reign of her Idolatry on the ruins of the ancient Christianity of Britain.

Our time will not permit me this evening to say more on the singularly interesting topic of ancient British Christianity. For the same reason I must abstain from noticing a number of statements scattered through the pages of the pamphlet. It is more profitable to consider the grand question in dispute —that of Church authority. If Rome can prove her claims, (and you have them set forth in Mr. Maturin's letter by her own chosen champion), then she in the main substantiates her position to be the only true Church. But if these claims are disproved, the Church of Rome stands convicted of the vilest fraud ever attempted,—a fraud in the upholding of which human blasphemy has been mingled with Satanic craft. She must be bereft of her title to the very name of a Christian Church; and men must be warned against her as one of the greatest instruments for the ruin of immortal souls.

Let me start with one proviso. My remarks are directed against a system, not against individuals who go by its name. There are many Romanists who are far better than their Church—it is not possible they could be worse. If they were properly enlightened respecting the teaching and prac-

tices of Rome, they would no doubt come out of her, and touch no longer the unclean thing.

The grand question in dispute, that on which hinges all the controversy between Rome and us, is the question of "THE CHURCH." Mr. Maturin thus states it:—"And after all, it must be observed that the proper test of orthodoxy or heresy does not consist so much in *particular doctrines* as in *general principles*. The great question is between the *principle* of *Church authority* and the *principle of private judgment;*" &c.

Now this is an incorrect because imperfect, statement of the grounds of opposition between Popery and Protestantism. It is true of the Church of Rome that she stands or falls with the "*principle of Church authority.*" But it is not true of Protestantism that its opposing principle is that of private judgment. When the question is asked, what guide are we to take in Spiritual matters? Rome answers, be guided by the authority of the Church—Protestants answer be guided by the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, and in the hearts of believers.

The object of this lecture is not to establish Protestant doctrines but to examine "the claims of the Catholic Church."

"Which then is the true Church of Christ?" "She alone possesses all the marks of the true Church laid down in the Creed." "The *Church is Divine*, therefore all she teaches is true, certain, and infallible." Here we have a variety of statements, amplified and explained in Mr. Maturin's pamphlet, pp. 86–92. They may be summed up thus: Christ has established on earth the Church as a distinct Society, which is always to exist, visible, infallible, without fail, and separate from all other societies, civil or spiritual. This Church has four marks by which it may be discovered, viz: Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolicity. These marks are all exhibited by the Church of Rome, and by no other;

therefore she is the only true Church of Christ, and every doctrine taught by her as an article of faith must be received on divine authority. To this I reply,

1st. That the foregoing, in the Popish sense of it, is not a correct description of the Church of Christ upon earth.

2nd. That if it was correct, it is not in the least applicable to the Church of Rome.

I. It is true that the Lord Jesus Christ has founded a Church upon the earth; but it is not true that Visibility is an essential characteristic of that Church. There is no passage of Scripture in which it is promised that the Church should always be visible. We know from the statements of the New Testament that the true Church is to consist of those for whom Christ died—whom He purchased with His blood—and that these persons are often hidden from the knowledge of man, though well known unto Him who is Head over all things to the Church. The eye of a Prophet once scanned anxiously the face of ancient Israel; and though an inspired man his testimony was, "the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy Prophets with the sword; and I, even I only am left; and they seek my life to take it away."—1 Kings, xix, 14. Every sign of a visible church of God had been blotted out, yet the the Lord declared, verse 18, "I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." Here was an invisible Church—one unseen by man—unknown to man—in existence before God, amid the millions of apostate Judah and Israel, after the last tokens of visibility had perished.

But as pertains to the present discussion, it is of more importance to show, as I shall now do,

II. That the description which Rome gives of the Church of Christ is not in the least applicable to that society of which

the Bishop of Rome is the head. I shall prove to you that this Church is neither Catholic nor Apostolic, nor holy—that her unity is an empty boast—that, instead of being a Church of God, she is a synagogue of Satan, and a deceiver of the souls of men.

Papists are very fond, when it suits them, of escaping any reference to Scripture; nevertheless they are compelled to look for some foundation in the New Testament for all these claims. "This great question," says Mr. Maturin, p. 73, "is for ever settled in the words of the memorable promise of our Lord to the Apostle Peter, (Matt. xvi, 18), 'Thou art Peter and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"

Now the promise in this passage is not made to Peter at all. In the original it stands thus, "thou art Petros and upon this petra I will build my Church," &c. Here our Lord contrasts in a striking manner the *unfitness* of *Peter* for a foundation, with the fitness of faith in Himself as the living rock. For Petros does not mean a rock, but a moveable stone—such a stone as a man can roll—while petra does not mean a stone but a solid bed of rock, immoveable and fit for a foundation. Hence it is recorded in John i, 43, "Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone." So that our Lord really said, thou art Petros, a moveable stone, and upon this petra, myself, the immovable Rock, will I build my Church.

But if Rome is infallible she can afford to despise all the rules of language, and set grammar at defiance. Though she may do this she can hardly afford to despise her own infallibility. I summon it to my aid. Every Romish priest swears he will not take or interpret Holy Scripture "otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—(Creed Pope Pius IV.) I demand that they shall interpret this fundamental passage of Scripture according to their own

rule. What say the Fathers? They are not unanimous, therefore, by Rome's own rule she should give no interpretation of this passage. Worse still for her infallibility, she has spoken, and the majority of the Fathers are against her. Augustine, Ambrose, Hilary, Chrisostom, Gregory, (Nyssa), and others, agree in differing from the Church of Rome.

Augustine,—"Jesus said not, thou art the rock, but, thou art Peter. The rock was Christ, whom Peter confesssed."

Cyprian,—"Christ himself is the rock."

Jerome,—"The Catholic Church is founded with a firm root on the rock Christ."

Chrysostom,—"He did not say, upon Peter, for he did not found it upon a man, but upon faith. What, therefore, meant, 'upon this rock?' Upon the confession contained in his words."

I might multiply these quotations, but forbear.

Still, hear how Rome, with unblushing front, repeats, "Peter is the Rock." Let Peter answer for himself. Compare Acts, ii, 11, 12, with iv, 10, 12.

Hear the voice of Rome: Peter is Prince of the Apostles.

Hear the Word of God: Luke xxii, 24, 25.

Hear the voice of Rome: Peter is the foundation of the Church—Popes are his successors.

Hear the Word of God: "Then began Peter to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man."—(Matt. xxvi, 74.)

Peter, Peter, thou hast denied Christ—thou hast lied—thou art cursing and swearing. Such conduct is a fitting foundation for the Church of Rome—it is no foundation for the Church of Christ.

Notwithstanding all this, hear the eager shout from Rome: "Peter is Primate—Prince of the Apostles."

Again, let us hear the Word of God: Gal. ii. 11, 14.

Peter, What is this that we hear? What art thou doing at

Antioch? Dissembling! walking not uprightly! Then Peter thou wast not infallible. And Peter, Paul rebuked thee before all the Church. Then thou wast not Bishop, Primate, or Prince.

The claim which Rome sets up for Peter is one which he would have been ashamed to set up for himself. I have shown from the structure of language, the opinions of the Fathers, better still for the authoritative teaching of Scripture that these claims of the Church of Rome are utterly false. I proceed now to examine the assertions made by Papists that their Church is founded on Peter. Without any hesitation I assert that the Church of Rome has no connection whatever with the Apostle Peter.

Papists assert that Peter was first Bishop of Antioch, that he removed thence to Rome where he abode for twenty-five years, and was Bishop of Rome. This statement is substantially repeated by Mr. Maturin. The weight of evidence is decidedly against Peter's having ever been at Rome. Romanists adduce as Scripture evidence 1 Peter v. 13, "The Church that is at Babylon elected together with you saluteth you." This passage, say they, shows that Peter was at Rome when he wrote his Epistle, because Rome is called Babylon in the Book of Revelation. Now the Book of Revelation was not written until thirty years after Peter's decease; and it was in it that for the first time the name of Babylon was prophetically applied, not to the city of Pagan Rome, as then existing, but to the Apostate Church which was to arise in the city after her temporal dominion had been divided among ten kingdoms. In Peter's day no such name as Babylon was applied to Rome, but there were two places so-called in Egypt and Syria, from either of which he may have penned his Epistle.

Their next proof is from Papias, who lived about a hundred years after Peter. This witness says he *heard* that Peter wrote his Epistle at Rome. He was one of the Fathers,

but was a genuine old wife—a great dealer in improbable stories, and Eusebius calls him "a man of exceeding weak and undiscerning judgment." We may set aside his evidence without ceremony.

Next comes Irenæus, who was also a Father, but a man of very different stamp from Papias. Irenæus wrote about A. D. 179 to the effect that the Church of Rome was founded by Peter and Paul, and that they appointed Linus to succeed them. I decline to receive the testimony of Irenæus, because it is contrardictory to the New Testament, which shows that neither Paul nor Peter founded the Church of Rome, and because his statement about Linus is contradicted by other Fathers. Surely Papists cannot object to a poor heretic like myself for wishing to have the unanimous consent of the Fathers

It would be mere waste of time to analyse the remaining evidence for Peter's having been at Rome, which of course becomes weaker and weaker as we descend from Apostolic times. But I cannot forbear referring to one astounding proof. It must seem hard to a credulous Romanist that we Protestants will not believe that Peter ever was at Rome. Have they not got his chair—the very chair on which he sat when, as Prince of the Apostles, he was first Pope, and all men kissed his toe? Alas for the legend! There is the chair,—it is called the chair of Peter, But when the French occupied Rome in the days of the first Napoleon, their infidelity could not be satisfied with mere heresay. The chair was stripped of its trappings—brought to the light—critically examined by competent scholars. Lo! it was found to be of comparatively modern construction, and inscribed with the well known creed of the Arabian Deceiver—"There is one God, and Mahometis his prophet.

Let us now look at the evidence on the other side that Peter never was at Rome. He was not the Apostle of the uncircumcised or Gentiles, but of the circumcision or Jews.

It is at Jerusalem we are to look for him, and there we find him. He was once at Antioch, where he was rebuked of Paul about A. D. 50. But on other occasions he is found at his post. In the first chapter of Galatians Paul records how he went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, and visited Peter. The Acts of the Apostles shows that during the next few years Peter was a resident in Jerusalem. Another time, seventeen years after his conversion, Paul returns to the city of his people, and Peter is still living there as the Apostle of the circumcision.

After this when on his fifth journey, which, for the *first time*, brought Paul to Rome, he wrote, about A. D. 60, his Epistle to the Romans, which shows clearly that the Church there was not founded by an Apostle at all, and that Peter was not in Rome at the time, for he closes with an address to many of the chief persons in that Church, yet never mentions Peter —a thing inconceivable if he had been its chief pastor. Soon after writing his Epistle, Paul reached Rome as a prisoner, and abode two years in his hired house. During this time he wrote some Epistles, in which, as in that to Colossians, he sends messages from those about him. Still no word of Peter. Further, in A. D. 66, the year in which both Peter and Paul are believed to have suffered death, Paul writes his second Epistle to Timothy, in which occurs this remarkable statement: "At my first answer no man stood with me; but all men forsook me." Will it be said that Peter was then in Rome. If so, we have Scripture testimony that he did a second time deny his Lord. But if we shrink from this conclusion, we are compelled to maintain that Peter was not at that time nor at any other time present in the city of Rome; and that he had no personal connection of any kind with the Church.

Up to this point it has been shown that the alleged primacy of Peter over the apostles is a mere empty pretext, without

any foundation in Scripture or in history; that it is in the highest degree improbable that Peter ever was at Rome, or had any connection with its Church there; that this Church was not founded by the Apostles at all. Thus have been destroyed the presumptuous claims of Rome to Primacy and Apostolicity; for they have been shown to rest on a miserable pretence, and on an improbable supposition. Further, I would add that even if Peter was Primate, and in addition had spent all his days in Rome, there would remain for discussion two very important questions before the claims of Popery could in any way be substantiated. Our opponents would require to prove that the Popes were lawful successors of Peter—inheriting his authority; and that the church of Christ at Rome in the days of Paul, was identical with the present corrupt and degraded system which goes by the name of the Church of Rome.

The next point which naturally arises for examination is the claims of the Popes to be considered the successors of the apostle Peter, and supreme Pontiffs over the universal Church. Suppose it was granted (which it is not) that Peter had lived in Rome as Primate over the Church, where is the proof from Scripture or from history that he had power to transmit this authority to other men after him? I ask for proof, and am answered by bold statements, remarkable for nothing but their impudence. After Peter died, John, the beloved apostle, lived in the full exercise of his holy office for a period of nearly forty years. Will it be pretended that Peter could take any man, and by laying on of his hands exalt him to a superiority over this venerable apostle who had received his high authority from the Lord Himself—who had leaned on His sacred breast—who had been his most cherished friend—to whom He appeared in glory, saying, "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore."? The thought is too preposterous to be conceived. Yet Papists

must maintain this ridiculous assumption, that the ordination of Peter gave more authority than the ordination of our Lord, according to their theory that Peter ordained a successor to be Primate over the whole Church.

The next difficulty in the way of the Pope's succession is even more serious than the last. It reminds me of an occurrence in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. On her arrival at a certain town there was no salute fired to welcome her majesty, but the mayor appeared to apologise for the omission. He told the Queen that he had twenty-seven good reasons to give for not firing the salute. The first reason was that they had no guns—whereupon the Queen graciously declined hearing the remaining twenty-six. Now, when I ask who was the first bishop after Peter, there may be twenty-seven reasons for not answering the question, but the first is the best. There was no successor. Papists cannot agree among themselves who was the first Pope. Scripture is silent—the Fathers contradictory. Tertullian and Ruffinus say that Clement was first pastor at Rome—Irenæus and Eusebius say, nay, it was Anucletus. Epiphanus and Optatus are partial to the claims of Cletus, while Augustine introduces a fourth, by name of Linus. It would require infallibility working at high pressure to settle this point. Since these things are so, I might be excused from giving other reasons why we cannot hold the Popes to be successors of Peter. But on this point I shall proceed to make assurance doubly sure, by revealing some of the links in this marvellous succession. In the year 1033 a Pontiff began to reign under the name of Benedict IX. This man was a vile creature, guilty of every crime. So base was his conduct that the Romans expelled him from the city, but he was soon restored by the German Emperor. As he continued his guilty course of life, the citizens again drove him forth in the year 1044, and gave the Pontifical chair to Sylvester III. By force of arms once more Benedict recovered his power;

but finding his seat untenable, he sold the office of Pope to Gregory VI. The dispute now lay between Sylvester and Gregory. At last, in A. D. 1046, the Emperor Henry III assembled a Council, which deposed all these, Benedict, Sylvester, and Gregory,—declared them unworthy of their office, and raised to the Popedom Clement II.

Let us now pass on to the Fourteenth Century, and take another glance at the history of the succession. During this period we find Popes accused and convicted of fearful crimes, of heresy, simony, dishonesty, and of other more abominable offences. We find the boasted unity of Rome made a mockery by the existence, during half a century, of a Pope at Rome and a Pope at Avignon—both claiming to be the Head of the Church, and Vicar of Christ, excommunicating each other, cursing the adherents of each other, dividing Christendom, and destroying religion. During this period too we find the Church that claims to be one and indivisible so rent within itself that its members were pursuing one another to death—even by burning, on account of their dissentions. Let us now pass again to the Fifteenth Century.

This Century opened with the spectacle of two rival Popes —Boniface IX at Rome, and Benedict XIII at Avignon. After the death of Boniface, and the usual disgusting scenes of plotting, intriguing, perjuring, on the part of those who professed to be the shepherds of Christ's Church, a Council, assembled at Pisa 1409, deposed and excommunicated both these Pontiffs, declaring them to be heretical, obstinate, perjured, and unworthy of any of the honors of the Church. While this state of things continued the Cardinals having met at Pisa elected Balthusa Cossa to be Pope by name of John XXIII. Few greater villains than this Pope have disgraced the nature of man, though I should be far from calling him the worst of the Popes. For it may not only be fearlessly stated, but it can be abundantly proved, that of all the mon-

sters that have defiled our earth the greatest have sat upon the pretended chair of St. Peter at Rome. In the year 1415, the Council of Constance deposed John XXIII from being Pope, on account of crimes such as simony, extortion, poisoning, adultery, incest, of which they found him guilty.

But this is by no means a full statement of the evil condition of the Popish Church at that time. Besides John XXIII, the Council of Constance had to deal with two other Popes—all living at the same time—all claiming to be Vicars of Christ—all trying to prove their claims by the strength of their anathemas. If you were to take every virtue for which all three ever got credit from their own adherents and roll them together they would not make a decent character for one layman, nevertheless they did for Popes. They were no worse than many who went before them, or than others who came after them in that office. They cared nothing for religion, which they disgraced by their lives. The only guide of their conduct was their own fancied interest. One good service they rendered to future times, they exposed the empty boast of Rome to unity, as well as to holiness and infallibility, for it is not easy to believe in the unity of a Church which was openly split into three sections—the various nations of Christendom ranking into three parties, under as many infallible successors of Peter.

I might proceed with these sickening details—each page becoming darker than the last in its catalogue of enormities—but this is surely needless. Enough has been stated to show that these Popes, reeking with every foul and abominable crime cannot be the Vicars of the Holy Jesus. Is ordination, even if they had got it from Peter, and could prove their descent, of such virtue that it can bestow heavenly power on monsters that seem ripe for perdition? Do they not know, on the express declaration of Peter himself, that Judas by transgression fell from his Apostleship? And while I verily believe

that if Rome has Apostolicity at all it is only such as Judas could impart, of this I am sure that worse men than that son of perdition have been found among the Popes—men who have followed his apostacy and have not imitated his remorse.

As I have been led to refer to the unity of Rome, suffer me to pause in the investigation of her claims to supremacy, that in passing we may dispose of this point. Papists are in the habit of boasting not a little of the unity in matters of faith and practice, which they say prevails in their Church—and they triumphantly contrast this unity with the divisions existing among Protestants. Mr. Maturin in his pamphlet adopts the same position. He says that the name Protestant "includes every variety of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, Arians, Socinians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians," &c., &c. Mr. Maturin must have been quite aware, if he ever wrote this sentence, that Protestants do not reckon Arians and Socinians to have any just title to the name of Christian. And if he does not know he ought to be informed that there is much more likeness between Unitarianism and Popery, than there is between Unitarianism and any leading Protestant Church. The examination of sects which Mr. Maturin gives is otherwise calculated to mislead. He must know very well that there is no sect of Calvinists or Arminians—that all the divisions among Protestants may be fairly reduced to four heads, viz: Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Independents, and Baptists, and these bodies do not differ in fundamental points of doctrine. They are at once as fellow Christians on all matters that pertain to salvation, while they differ on points of scholastic disputation and of external order. Let us grant that this is the case—that while we do not pretend to this unity, or lay any great stress on it, *we Protestants are substantially one.*

But is there unity in Rome? Most certainly not: no boast was ever made more empty. Bishop Hall has collected from

Popish writers proofs of the existence among Papists themselves, of three hundred controversies on important points of faith and practice. They have contended among themselves on the decrees of God, the doctrines of grace and free will. They are not as one as regards the external government of their Church; and are by no means agreed respecting the Immaculate Conception. And when we remember that Mr. Maturin, in common with all Papists, calls on men to bow to the authority of the Church while yet they have not settled among themselves to whom this authority belongs, or where the Church's infallibility is to be found, it certainly is a stretch of unwarrantable impudence to speak of the unity of the Church of Rome.

Some of the controversies within the Church of Rome have been of no trivial nature. The Dominicans and Jesuits waged a lengthened warfare with one another regarding the nature of Divine Grace, and its need for salvation. This contest involved topics so important as the inherent corruption of man, his ability to do good, God's grace, and predestination. Yet, thought these were discussed before two successive Popes, with Cardinals, Theologians, and Bishops, to help them, for a period of five years (1601 to 1606) there was not found enough of infallibility in the Church of Rome to settle the matter. Of what possible use is the pretended infallibility of the Church of Rome, if she cannot settle important disputes which have rent her unity?

But on this subject I cannot allow Mr. Maturin, or his Romish advisers, to depart with only one knotty question to answer. The points at issue between the Dominicans and the Jesuits were essentially the same as those in the beginning of the Fifth century discussed between Augustine and Pelagius. It so happens that Pelagius persuaded Losinius, who was then Bishop of Rome, that he was right, and Losinius gave his sentence in favor of Pelagius. But Augustine having better

instructed the Bishop, Losinius changed his mind, and severely condemned his former opinion. Further still, in the Sixteenth century, at the Council of Trent, held to be general, sacred, and infallible, a large part of the views of Pelagius were made articles of the Romish faith. Now, where is the unity, and where is the infallibility? Mr. Maturin says the Church of Rome can never alter or reconsider one article of faith. But here we have a Pope reconsidering himself, and a Council reconsidering twice thought over decisions of a Pope. If Losinius was right when he agreed witn Pelagius, then he was wrong when he agreed with Augustine. But if he was right when he agreed with Augustine, then the Council of Trent was wrong when it agreed with Pelagius.

But it is not merely in regard to the opinions of individual Popes or Councils that there is a want of unity in the faith of the Romish Church. Whole communions, important nations, have held different opinions from the Court of Rome, both regarding doctrine and government. The Belgian nation cleaves to the doctrines of Jansarius, although these were openly condemned by Pope Urban VIII, in 1642. And the French Church has always manifested views regarding the rights of kings and the authority of Councils diametrically opposed to the Popes. This was openly manifested in that celebrated convention held in Paris, A. D., 1682, when the assumptions of Rome were rebuked and the Gallican liberties asserted.

The French Church receives as infallible the decrees of the Council of Constance, which determined that a Council was superior to a Pope; while the Italians hold to be infallible that fifth Lateran Council, confirmed by Leo X, which decreed that a Pope was superior to a Council. Here we have nation against nation, Council against Council, Pope against Council, and Council against Pope, infallibility on one side of the Alps against infallibility on the other side of the Alps.

This looks to be very like dissention, but Rome sees nothing in it except a holy unity.

Let me now beg of you to go back with me to the question of the Pope's supremacy. It has been shown already that there is no foundation for this claim in Scripture, in history, or in the Fathers,—that Peter had no primacy over the apostles—that he never was in Rome—that the line of descent is broken at the beginning, while it is marred with innumerable blots and breaks throughout its pretended course. There remains, however, one of Mr. Maturin's statements regarding this matter to which I should like to direct your attention. He expresses his surprise that we should ask Romanists "to demonstrate the supremacy of the Pope," &c. "It is sufficient for us to reply that the Church is already in actual possession of these doctrines for 1800 years," &c. (p. 40.) Mr. Maturin further states, (pp. 39–41), the way in which he proves that the Church has had this long possession of these doctrines—"We go back to the earliest ages—we examine the writings of the Fathers, and the decrees of Councils, and we find manifest traces of the same general system as far as the evidence goes." "It is admitted that the Church of Rome, in the first century, was in possession of the pure doctrines of the Gospel. It must be proved, then, that the Church of the second century was essentially different in doctrine from that of the first century, and so on, and consequently that the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century is essentially the same in doctrine with the Church of Rome in the first century."

Here we have two separate methods by which Mr. Maturin would prove the apostolicity of a doctrine, e. g. that of the Pope's Supremacy:

1. By supposing that, century after century, no essential change has taken place, so that the nineteenth truly represents the first.

2. By direct evidence.

This first method may be disposed of very shortly. I deny that there was a Church *of* Rome at all in the first century. There was a Church *of Christ in* Corinth, *in* Ephesus, *in* Jerusalem, *in* Antioch, and *in* Rome. But a Church *of* Rome there was not; and I defy Mr. Maturin to prove there was. Besides the mode of argument is altogether fallacious. If the infant of to-day is not essentially different from the infant of yesterday, shall it be said that there is no essential change when it passes through the different stages of youth, manhood, old age, disease and death? We are left to fall back on the direct evidence of Fathers and Councils, and here I meet his mere assertion with overwhelming evidence to the contrary. There is abundant evidence to show that in the early ages of the Church the Fathers and the Churches generally did resist and repel the arrogant assumptions of the Bishops of Rome—that they were far from accepting their decrees, or honouring their supremacy.

About A. D. 190, Victor, Bishop of Rome, ventured to excommunicate some Churches in Asia Minor, on the ground that Rome was the Apostolic seat. But these Churches strongly maintained their equality with Rome, on the ground of their Apostolicity. At the same time Irenæus, the celebrated Father so often appealed to as authority by Mr. M., wrote a letter to the Roman Bishop Victor, in which he rebuked with severity his unchristian arrogance, and told him plainly that the unity of the Church consisted, not in outward forms, but in faith and love. Irenæus further objected to receive the tradition of any one Church, on the ground that tradition often originates in, and is perpetuated by, simplicity and ignorance.

In the third century Cyprian, another well-known Father of the Church, writing to Stephen, Bishop of Rome, thus addressed him:—"In virtue of our equal dignity, and in unfeigned love, we have imparted these things to you," &c.

Again Cyprian says:—"No one should make himself a Bishop of Bishops." Stephen appealed to the authority of Roman tradition, and spoke against innovations. But Cyprian replied that it was Stephen who made the innovations, and who broke away from the unity of the Church.—"Whence then," continues Cyprian, "comes that tradition? Is it derived from the words of our Lord, or from the authority of the Gospels, or from the instructions and the letters of the Apostles? Custom, which has crept in among some unawares, ought not to hinder the truth from prevailing and triumphing; for custom, without truth, is only inveterate error." Again he adds, and let Papists mark this opinion of a Father:—"It is no more beneath the dignity of a Roman Bishop than of any other man to suffer himself to be corrected when he is wrong."

Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, also rebuked this same Stephen, Bishop of Rome—charged him with rending the unity of the Church, and proved that the Roman tradition was a departure from the customs of the Church at Jerusalem, and of the ancient Apostolical Churches.

One more proof I shall adduce that this supremacy of the Bishops of Rome was unknown to the ancient Church. It is even more remarkable than the foregoing. In the year 357, Liberius, the Roman Pontiff, apostatized from the Christian faith—signed an Arian creed, and joined in condemning Athanasius. Mr. Maturin ranks Arians (though untruly) among Protestant sects. Yet a Roman Pontiff was an Arian! Now listen how this shameful falling away was received by his cotemporaries. Hilary—a Father of the Church, and a Saint in the Romish Calendar—wrote to the erring Pope:—"I anathematize thee, O Liberius, thee and thy companions; again I anathematize thee; and for the third time I say unto thee, O Liberius, thou art a prevaricator."

After the production of these proofs from Christian antiquity, and with the knowledge that there is abundance yet remaining, I hold myself entitled to denounce the fortieth page of Mr. Maturin's pamphlet as utterly discreditable and utterly untrue. He has adopted the usual course of Romish disputants—a course not remarkable for its honesty. He has published a work in which there are made high professions of personal holiness as well as pictures of remarkable learning. We have been told by him that it was his profound study of Ecclesiastical history that led him to own the supremacy of the Pope, and the authority of the Church of Rome. But I have shown you that his statements on the point are not true.

Ancient Church history has been called into court. She has given her evidence conclusively against these claims of the Popes and of the Church of Rome. So that now this champion of Catholic claims, with all his aiders and abettors, stands convicted before us of attempting a gross imposition on the inhabitants of this city and of this province. I do not wonder at it. They have high authority for such a course of management, for even a Pope has thought it needful to practise forgery in order to maintain his claims to supremacy. In the year 419 Pope Losinius, in order to maintain some of his assumptions, sent delegates to the Council of Carthage to present the canons of the Council of Nice as favorable to his claims. But the African Church found that the Nicene canons sent by Losinius were different from their own copies, and from the ancient MSS. presented at Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch. It was discovered that these Nicene canons of theP ope were never put forth by the Council of Nice at all—that they were the work of a pretended Council at Sardica, which were thus palmed off under the venerable name of the Nicene Fathers, and that this Council of Sardica, as it was called, was another specimen of trickery and fraud on the part of Popes of Rome. Here let me present an alternative

to the members of the Church of Rome. Either Pope Losinius knew the aforesaid canons to be forged or he did not. If he did, then it is plain he could not believe in his own supremacy when he used such foul means to maintain it. If he did not know them to be forged what became of his infallibility?

Let us now look at this question from another point of view. The Church of Rome demands our obedience to her authoritative teaching on two grounds. First—Because she is the sole keeper of Apostolical Tradition. Second—Because she is Infallible.

Mr. Maturin says:—"Divine traditions are those taught by our Lord himself—Apostolical traditions are those taught by his Apostles. But as both classes, though originally delivered in a separate form, were committed to the Church by the Apostles, they both are usually included under the name Apostolical." Then, after quoting from the Council of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius IV., Mr. Maturin goes on to say:—"Such, then, is the meaning of tradition as an equal and independent source of Divine revelation with Scripture, both together making up the complete Rule of Faith, and both interpreted by the voice of the Catholic Church."

It would be unreasonable to expect a quotation of all Mr. Maturin's sayings on this point. I refer you to his pamphlet, pages 44 to 67.

On page 50 Mr. Maturin says:—"And the whole system of Christianity would have been precisely the same at the present day if the New Testament had never been written at all. This is, indeed, exactly the case supposed by St. Irenæus in the latter part of the second century, in opposition to the heresies of his time, and we find the modern Catholic line of argument fully adopted by him, and a few years afterwards by Tertullian, in which they both appeal to the constant tradition of the Church, and the unbroken succession of Bishops from the Apostles, in refutation of the doctrines of heretics,

who always appealed to their own interpretation of Scripture in opposition to the doctrine of the Catholic Church."

This is an appeal to Church history in support of Tradition. I accept the challenge—at the same time maintaining that this is not the true ground on which the matter is to be tested.

Irenæus and Tertullian do not hold the views attributed to them by Mr. Maturin. Irenæus says:—"The Scriptures are truly perfect, as having been spoken by the word of God and His Spirit." He says that the two Testaments overthrew Paganism even as the two pillars of the house on which Samson leaned overthrew the Philistines. He asserts the verbal inspiration of the New Testament as proof that the Holy Spirit had provided in Scripture against the corruptions of heretics. Nay more, he says that in every controversy with heretics to say "thus we learn out of the Scriptures," was full and final proof. Irenæus was very far from saying as Mr. Maturin has imputed to him—that Christianity would have been the same if the New Testament had never been written. In arguing wich heretics, *he supposes a case*—"What, if the Apostles had left us no writings whatever? Ought we not to follow the tradition which they left with those to whom they committed the care of the Churches?" Here it is evident that instead of placing Tradition on an equality with the written word, he only looks on it as make-shift *in case* there had been no Scripture.

So far from answering heretics by the authority of tradition, as Mr. Maturin affirms they did, these two Fathers, Irenæus and Tertullian, (his own chosen witnesses) not only assert the supreme authority of Scripture in matters of faith, but the former also shows that it was the heretics who refused the authority of Scripture—twisted its meaning, and called in the aid of Apocryphal books; while Tertullian says—"I adore the fullness of Scripture." Truth is written on its

pages "with a ray of the sun itself." He strongly affirm that the only sure way of putting down heretics is by insisting that "all their questions be settled from Scripture alone." These two Fathers make it clear beyond doubt that the position of the heretics of their day was precisely that which Rome occupies in our time. Protestants have succeeded to the inheritance of truth left by Christ and His Apostles—while Rome is the great perverter of the Gospel scheme, the arch-heretic of all ages and of all lands.

Again in page 55 Mr. Maturin affirms "they (*i. e.*, the Fathers) did not hold (as Protestants now hold) that nothing is to be believed that is not contained in Scripture, as they expressly declared that the traditions of the Apostles are to be received as of equal authority with their writings. Such was the general language of the Christian Church in every age," &c., &c. And "it is certainly an unquestionable historical fact that the first Christian Churches were founded and organized by the Apostles in complete possession of all the doctrines of Christianity before a single line of the New Testament was ever committed to writing. Nothing is more clear than this, that the Church and not the Bible was the Rule of Faith to these Christians," &c., &c.

This is ingenious, but it is not very sound. It is based on a bold but false assumption, which must be exposed. Before doing so, let me remark that Mr. Maturin is singularly unhappy in his references to the Fathers. There is a strange obliquity about this man's mind—a perverse habit of misquotation, which it would require a large stretch of charity to think accidental.

Let us hear Irenæus once more in his dispute with heretics. "When convicted by the Scriptures, they turn about to accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were imperfect and wanting in authority, and uncertain, and as if one could not find the truth in them if ignorant of tradition,

for that was given, not in writing, but by the living voice."

Hear Origen, saying "that the sacred volumes breathe the fullness of the Spirit, and that there is nothing in Prophets, in Law, in Gospel, or in Apostles, which does not come down from the fullness of the majesty of God."

Hear Ambrose—"Drink both the cup of the Old and that of the New Testament, for in both it is Christ that thou drinkest. Drink Jesus Christ, that thou mayest drink the blood whereby thou hast been redeemed. Drink Jesus Christ, in order that thou mayest drink in all his sayings. We drink Holy Scripture, we devour Holy Scripture, when the juice of the everlasting Word descends into the veins of our mind and penetrates the energies of our soul."

In the meantime let this much from the Fathers suffice. Let us now look at the mode in which the early Christians received the faith. Was the Church or the Word of God their rule? For answer, I will at present accept the starting point chosen by Mr. Maturin, page 52—" 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' We find from the Acts of the Apostles that they proceeded to fulfil their commission, and thus the unwritten Word was certainly the first Rule of Faith to the primitive Christians."

This assertion, and foregoing ones quoted from Mr. Maturin's pamphlet, contain perversions of the facts of Scripture, which, if they proceeded from ignorance, would be disgraceful to a Sabbath School child. Our Saviour had not two sets of doctrines—one for the people and one for His Apostles. He answered the High Priest—"I spake openly to the world, I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing." (John xviii. 20.) So that when He went up on High, and enjoined His Apostles to teach whatsoever He commanded,

they had no secret doctrine to keep or to teach regarding either faith or practice. Their main duty as teachers is explained by our Lord himself, and by the practice of the Apostles Peter and Paul.—(Acts i. 8.)—"But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be *witnesses* unto me." It was their great work to bear witness for Christ. But their witness was not the Rule of Faith to the first Christians. Nothing can be more plain from the teaching of the Apostles, as recorded in the book of Acts, than this, that *they based their preaching on the Old Testament.* They claimed from their hearers a Divine faith in its predictions, because it was the Word of God; they claimed for themselves only the belief that belongs to honest evidence. There, they said, are the prophecies which point to Christ; here are we, living witnesses that these things are fulfilled. This is precisely the position taken up by Peter in the first Christian sermon. (Acts ii.) He refers to the prophecies of Joel and of Daniel; then adds, "This Jesus God raised up, whereof we are *witnesses.*" It is in remarkable consistency with this view that we find the *doctrines* of Christianity to be the *facts* of the New Testament. Our religion is not based on opinions, but on facts. The birth, life, death of Christ—his miracles, sayings, resurrection, ascension, were all taught to the first believers as matters of personal evidence. It is as matters of historical evidence that they have come down to us. Now, evidence is not Tradition, in the Popish sense. When a witness enters our courts of law, we do not say that he delivers his tradition, but he gives his evidence.* It is a mere abuse of language to confound these terms as Mr. Maturin has done.

---

* When the Apostles wrote about their tradition, they meant, in accordance with their phraseology, to say that they had borne witness to facts personally known to them. According to all the laws of evidence, Apostolical oral Tradition ceased with the lives of the eye-wit-

With regard to the passages quoted by Mr. Maturin—pages 47, 48, 49,—in support of tradition, Protestants do not deny that the Apostles' oral teaching, when inspired by the Holy Spirit, was authoritative. They do deny that we have any means of knowing what that oral teaching was save through Scripture; and, further, they maintain that if this oral teaching had been handed down to us the Scripture must still be its judge. Mr. Maturin allows that Scripture is the Word of God. God cannot contradict Himself. Written statements are more certain than verbal reports. We test the less certain by that which is more certain. Consequently oral tradition (if there is such a thing) must be tested by the acknowledged Word of God. It was on this principle that the Apostle Paul acted when he opposed and rebuked Peter—Gal., ii, 11, 14. Here is abundant proof that even at that early time there was a Gospel of truth for a guide to Apostles—for a test of their teaching. The Gospel was superior to Apostles, for Paul appealed, and Peter submitted, to it. We are afforded also, by this passage, proof of the fallibility of Peter's tradition—of his oral teaching. Now the Romish Church cannot have a better, purer tradition than Peter had; so, as his was fallible

---

nesses of the life of Jesus. It could only be preserved in the New Testament.

Mr. Maturin labors hard to make tradition authoritative, and to confound the Apostles' witness with *this* authority. But there is an evident distinction that must not be overlooked. The value of a fact is one thing, the mode of establishing it is another and very different thing. If it can be ascertained as a fact that a certain person stands related to certain other persons, he will get an estate. Surely, when a witness enters the court, and proves the relationship, he does not *make* that relationship by his evidence. Neither does he give value to the relationship; the evidence only brings it to light. So, when the Apostles bore witness to the birth, death, resurrection of Jesus, they did not make these facts what they were, neither did they give them their place of value in the Gospel scheme; they merely brought these facts to the knowledge of certain communities. The Divine authority resides, not in the evidence, but in the facts substantiated.

and inferior to Scripture, hers must be also. The chief tradition of Peter which Rome has kept is his denial of Christ. And she has not kept this perfectly, for she has not imitated his repentance.

Mr. Maturin's plausibilities regarding tradition have now been disposed of—they have been met and refuted. It will be proper now to advance a few steps with the argument. I refer you to the pamphlet, page 44. The writer says that the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation may be proved in two ways—"positively and negatively—either by internal or external evidence,—that is, either by an *express declaration of Scripture itself* (granting its Divine inspiration and Canonical authority) or *by disproving the existence* of any *other* rule of faith. But where does Scripture assert its own sufficiency as a complete record of Divine revelation? Is there a single passage in the Bible which declares that the whole revealed truth of God is contained in His written Word alone? We answer, without hesitation, *there is not one.* It is usual, indeed, to refer to some remarkable declarations of Scripture which relate to this subject, and especially to those three important passages—John, v, 39, Acts, xvii, and 2 Tim., iii, 15, 17. But it requires only a little attention to perceive that these passages do not establish the point."

Thus far Mr. Maturin. He has answered without hesitation, perhaps it would have been as prudent had he paused. I am glad to have these explicit statements put forth in the midst of us. Rome shall have her answer. She has stated what *is* proof, and that shall be given, both positive and negative, both internal and external. The Divine sufficiency of Scripture for salvation shall be proved from its own words. The existence of any other rule shall be disproved. And while, in regard to this argument, Mr. Maturin grants the Divine inspiration and Canonical authority of Scripture, this concession is by no means accepted as a favor or as being of

the slightest consequence, for had he denied them these things would have been proved likewise.

Let us begin with the positive proof. What saith Scripture regarding itself? For answer, I beg your attention to a short examination of the three passages chosen by Mr. Maturin himself, though by no means sure that these are the strongest to be found in the Bible.

John, v, 39—"Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me."

"Testify of Christ! Surely this is not the same as saying that they contain all that God has revealed to man." Now, this is not the question. It is a deliberate alteration of it. We have started on the enquiry, not whether Scripture contains all knowledge God has communicated to man, but whether "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." It is this latter question alone that we are at present concerned with. And I maintain, on the authority of God's Word, that to say the Scriptures "testify of Christ" is equivalent to saying that they do tell us all we need for salvation. I do not wonder that Romanists think there is not much in a Scripture testimony about Christ, for their Church has obscured His mediation, lowered the dignity, and insulted the agony of his sacrifice, so surrounded his intercessory office with saints and angels, that he cannot be to them "the chief among ten thousand, and the altogether lovely." But it was a very different view of the matter that was taken by the great Apostle of the Gentiles—"I determined," says he to the Corinthians, "to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." Are we to believe these, that Paul did not carry to the Corinthians knowledge necessary for salvation because he knew nothing among them save Jesus Christ? Are we to suppose that Peter (2 Peter, i, 1, 8) thought the knowledge of God a defective salvation, when, after enumerating the precious gifts of God's Spirit to

the redeemed, he says "If these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ?" Shall it be said that Paul made up all defects by his tradition? Then he tells us himself that the great work of his ministry (2 Cor., iv, 2) was not to handle "the Word of God deceitfully."

But there is an accumulated misinterpretation of Scripture to be found in this pamphleteer who is guided by an infallible Church. When all the circumstances and the context are taken into consideration, these words of our Lord to the Jews will be found to contain a most striking rebuke of Rome and her tradition. The Lord Jesus Christ Himself at that time stood among the Jews as the Great Prophetic Teacher of the New Testament. He delivered his oral teaching, or, as Mr. Maturin would prefer to call it, his Divine Tradition. "He came unto his own but his own received him not." They did not believe him. Then he said (John v, 39) "If I bear witness of myself my witness is not true;" verse 32, etc., "There is another that beareth witness of me," &c. "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth—but I receive not testimony from man." "And the Father himself which hath sent me hath borne witness of me." "Search the Scriptures," &c.

Here we have the outline of this memorable transaction. Here we find our Lord Himself so honoring the written word of God that he does not insist upon the people who had it receiving without question even His own Divine teaching. In condescension he brings Himself, as it were, to the bar of Scripture, and bids men, with it in their hands, make it the judge regarding His claims to Messiahship. He does not say that the Old Testament was so full in point of matter that there was no need for the New; but He does say that the ancient Scriptures were so perfect that they afforded a suf-

cient rule for teaching the Divine truth of any oral teaching, —of any written statements, even of His own. He establishes conclusively that no Church gives authority to Scripture, but that the Bible is the supreme judge as to the teaching of any Church—that all tradition is subject to the written Word —must be tried by it—received or rejected by it. And this example of our Lord was followed carefully by His Apostles. We read (Acts xvii, 2.) how "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." And in verse 11 the Spirit of God records his approval of those who brought Apostolical tradition to the test of Scripture: "These were more noble than they of Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so." Can you desire a more picturesque description of the mode of teaching adopted by the Apostles, or one that more effectually destroys the claims of tradition while establishing the authority of Scripture. Paul, with his companions, enters a synagogue: he opens the roll of Moses and the Prophets, he reads the promises concerning the Mighty One who is to come—the prophet, like unto Moses—the Priest of royal line, of the order of Melchisedeck—of the house of David. He reads of his humiliation, sufferings, sorrow, death—how his face was more marred than any man —how he bore the iniquities of his people—making his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death. Then he would say, thus speaketh Scripture concerning Messiah, and here are we living witnesses that these things have met and centred in the person of Jesus Christ. And when some enquirer, filled with honest difficulty, would step forward and take the roll and read out of Scripture the prophecies concerning the kingly glory of Messiah, asking, how can you reconcile these statements with the particulars you have given of the sufferings of Jesus? did the Apostle crush enquiry

with the authority of his tradition? Did he not tell of the wonders of the resurrection—the vision of angels—the glory of Jesus—his marvellous ascension—his kingly throne at the right hand of the Father? adding that of these things we are witnesses. Thus was the New Testament Church "built on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone,"—and the great test, the square and rule applied to the whole was the one Infallible Word of God—the Scriptures which are the testimony of the Father Himself regarding Jesus. It is most certainly not on this principle that Romanists act in reasoning with Protestants. They do not test every fact, every doctrine taught them by their Church, with the touchstone of Scripture; but, placing their Church in a position which Christ and His Apostles never assumed, they make the holy Word of God bend and bow to their tradition.

There still remains for examination the third of the passages on which Mr. Maturin has chosen to hang the settlement of this question. And here I must complain of the discreditable method adopted by him in handling the passage. On page 44 he refers to it correctly enough, as 2 Timothy, iii, 15-17. But on page 46, when he comes to grapple with the difficulty it presents, he takes care to quote and comment on only one verse—leaving out of sight the remaining two verses, which present insuperable obstacles to the Romish doctrine. I forbear further remark on this conduct.

Let it be remembered that the question in dispute is this: "Does Holy Scripture contain all things needful to Salvation?" Can there be a plainer answer—"From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." To add one word would weaken the force of this inspired answer. But as though to meet an objection, more is said in the verses left out by Mr. Maturin. It might be

said, now if Scripture will do for the ordinary members of the Church how are its teachers to be fitted for their responsible office? To this it is replied, "All Scripture (i. e. all books shewn to be Scripture, whether of Old or New Testament) is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God (i. e. the minister of Christ) may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." I do not wonder that Mr. Maturin felt it impossible to handle this passage. It contains a statement of our Protestant views regarding the sufficiency of Scripture so clear—a rebuke of the pretences of Rome so powerful—that I feel it impossible to add to its effect by any explanation.

It is now time to look at the negative side of this question, and disprove the existence of any other rule of faith than Scripture. There are many pretended rules of faith,—such as the Hindu Shastres, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, and the Apostolical Traditions held by Rome. The present topic requires that attention should be given to this last; and I proceed to show that the Apostolic Traditions held by the Church of Rome are not a rule of faith for Christians. What are these traditions? Mr. Maturin's description is given at length on pages 67, 68, 69. I refer you to it, and copy Mr. Newman's far more condensed and powerful definition: "Whatever doctrine the primitive ages *unanimously attest*, whether by consent of Fathers or by Councils, or by the events of history, or by controversies, or in whatever way—whatever may be fairly and reasonably considered the universal belief of those ages is to be received as coming from the Apostles." Here, in precise language, Mr. Newman defines that which never had any existence—that shadow of a shade—the unanimous consent of primitive ages. This unanimous consent does not exist, and never did exist. It is not to be found in the ancient Creeds, or in the decrees of Councils—

in the writings of the Fathers, or in the Church of Rome herself.

Two of the earliest Creeds that have come down to us are those put forth by Tertullian and Origen. Each of them say that all the Churches agreed with them. If they did, it would matter little, as their Creeds are so short and general as to settle no point in dispute between us and Rome. But the statement is not true, as both these Fathers were diametrically opposed to each other on the intrepretation of Scripture; while, in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, they not only differ, but both of them are in error.

If we turn to look for unanimous Catholic consent in the Decrees of Councils, the result will be found still more unsatisfactory to the claims of Rome. A Council was an assembly of office-bearers of the Church, for the settlement of disputed points. It was intended that Councils should find out and publish the mind of the Church; but they never fulfilled this intention. In the early ages of Christianity Churches were not nations, neither were they so fully organized as they have been in our days, so that between the expense, the time, and the danger of travelling, comparatively few persons attended these Ecclesiastical assemblies. Then be it remembered that those who did go were not delegates to represent the opinions of others, but self-elected, and in their decisions they set forth merely their own views. So that these Councils cannot be held to represent fairly the opinions of Christendom. Take a glance at their structure. The first general Council met at Nice, A. D., 325. There were present at its meetings three hundred and eighteen members. Of these, *one* came from all Africa, *one* from Spain, *one* from France. That is, there were present three Pastors to represent a third of Christendom, while from a significant patch of country, (Isauria,) without any great city, no less than seventeen Pastors were present. Not only were

Councils insufficient to represent the Universal Church, but we know that on almost every important point decided their authority was resisted. Further, the Councils contradict one another, so that what may be called "consent" now, is not consented to a few years after.

A. D., 325, The Council of Nice decided against Arianism.

A. D., 350, The Joints Councils of Ariminum and Selucia, with vastly more members than at Nice, decided in favor of Arianism.

A. D., 448, The Council of Constantinople condemned the Eutychian heresy.

A. D., 449, The Second General Council at Ephesus decided in favor of the Eutychian heresy.

A. D., 451, The Council of Chalcedon again decided against it.

I might prolong this list until your patience was exhausted, but surely enough has been said to show that unanimous consent, in other words Apostolical Tradition, is not to be found among the Councils of the Church. Let us now enquire if it has taken shelter among the Fathers?

Here we find differences and disputes innumerable upon things trivial and upon matters of the highest moment. They disagree in the interpretation of individual passages of Scripture—they differ as to the general principles of Scripture interpretation. There is a continual clashing of opinions among them as to matters of fact, points of doctrine, and arrangements of discipline. Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, contend with Dionysius, Alexandrinus, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome, as to whether the passages in the Book of Revelation regarding the New Jerusalem are to be interpreted after an earthly manner, or according to a spiritual meaning. The Bishops of Asia Minor dispute with Pope Victor about the observance of Easter. Cyprian contended with Stephen about the baptism of heretics. Tertullian and Jerome differ-

ed in regard to the production of the human soul. "Some of the Fathers hold that the meeting together of the faithful at the Eucharist thrice a week is an Apostolic tradition—others maintain the contrary. Some think that our Saviour suffered death in the fortieth or fiftieth year of his age—others would persuade us that he died in the thirtieth or thirty-first year of his age: both which opinions are manifestly contrary to the text of the Gospel." They differed as to the original position of Presbyters and Bishops—whether they were of equal or differing degree. They could not agree regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit. And on many other topics waged disputes with more or less bitterness. We leave the Fathers; and we leave them, satisfied that no unanimous consent, and consequently no Apostolical tradition, is to be found among them.

Lastly, there is no such thing as unanimous consent to be found in the Church of Rome herself. I have shown before how she is rent with divisions regarding doctrine and government. So that her boasted unity is one of the most false and flattering tales ever attempted to be palmed on the credulity of mankind. It is not necessary to recur to these points. In connection with the present topic, I shall prove to you that so far from being unanimous regarding her unwritten traditions the Church of Rome is not as one respecting the true edition of the Scriptures; and, more wonderful still, she has not yet settled where her infallibility is to be found.

Here is a short sketch of the history of Rome's Latin Bible. Latin versions of the Scriptures were early made for the sake of the latin speaking Christians. One of the Fathers named Jerome made a translation which superseded the old Vulgate. In the seventh century Pope Gregory I. sanctioned Jerome's Vulgate, and it was exclusively adopted by the Romish Church. The Council of Trent ordained "that the

Vulgate alone should be esteemed authentic in the public reading of Scripture, in disputations, in preaching, in expounding, and that no one should dare to reject it on any pretext whatever."

Thus decreed the last General Council held by Papists to be infallible. Not many years, however, after this authoritative decree, Pope Sextus V. found this Vulgate, approved by an infallible Council, so incorrect that he published a new edition. This edition was from twenty to twenty-five years in preparation under three infallible Popes, yet when it came to the light it was found to be teeming with errors; not less than two thousand were speedily discovered in it, and it was suppressed by the infallibility of Pope Gregory XIV.—After all this, in 1592 another edition was brought out (of course infallible like the rest) by Pope Clement VIII. Surely the infallibility that will stand all this knocking about must have a brazen constitution.

But at length we come to consider that circumstance which makes all the presumptuous pretensions of the Church of Rome fit subject of ridicule and contempt on account of their high sounding emptiness, or of righteous indignation on account of their being a deliberate fraud and imposition. The Church of Rome has never yet settled where her infallibility is to be found. The Italians say it is in the Pope—the French say it is in a General Council—others, again, say it is in a Pope and a Council united; and one of her eminent theologians says "that the Church has not chosen to settle the controversy." The Church of Rome has tried her hand at infallibility, and has failed. She has mistaken her trade. She has patronized error, praised murder, maligned virtue, and persecuted religion. She has contradicted the Bible—and she has contradicted herself. We may set Creed against Creed, Council against Council, Father against Father, Pope against Pope, Pope against Council and Council against Pope, doctor against doctor, section of Rome against section of Rome, until the diversity becomes so marvellous as to be surpassed in wonder only by the impudence of the men who can boast of the unity, infallibility, apostolicity and holiness of Rome!